

Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-20 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1, 6-8, 12, 13, 19 and 20 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The amendments to the specification and claims do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Objection to Drawings

The objection to the drawings is rendered moot in light of the attached corrected drawings.

Objection to Specification

The objection to the abstract is rendered moot in light of the amendments to the specification.

Objection to Claims

The objection to the claims is rendered moot in light of the amendments to the Claim 12.

Rejection Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection alleges that Claim 1 recites the limitation “utility program” in line 9 lacks insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 includes the limitation of “a first utility program” at line 7, which is also specified at line 9 as “said first utility program”. Claim 1 also includes the limitations of “a second utility program” at line 13, which is also specified at line 15 as “said second utility program”. Accordingly, Applicants assert that there is sufficient antecedent basis for both a first utility program and a second utility program, and the limitation “utility program” is not contained in Claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaplin et al. (US Patent No. 6,519,635). The rejection alleges that Champlin discloses: a) a sending application resident on a first computer system selecting a transport mechanism and passing data to a first utility program resident on said first computer system; b) said first utility program, adding a token, a data type category identifier, and a data type identifier to said data to form an information packet and then, transparently to said sending application, using said transport mechanism to transmit said information packet to a second computer system; c) a second utility program, resident on said second computer system, locating said data type identifier in said information packet using said token; d) said second utility program indexing a relevant category

of an application registry with said data type identifier to determine a destination application that is associated with said data type identifier, wherein said application registry comprises identifiers categorized into a plurality of different data type categories and wherein said data type category identifier of said information packet identifies said relevant category; and e) supplying said data packet to said destination application.

Applicants respectfully assert that Champlin does not disclose a first utility program adding a token, a first category type identifier corresponding to the data type of the data, and a first data type identifier corresponding to the data type of the data, to the data to form an information packet. Champlin also does not disclose the second utility program locating the first data type identifier and the first category type identifier in the information packet using the token. Champlin also does not disclose the second utility program indexing a relevant one of a plurality of category types of an application registry. The relevant category of the application registry being indexed utilizing the first data type identifier to determine a destination application. Wherein the relevant one of the plurality of categories corresponds to the first category type identifier. Champlin also does not disclose an application registry comprising a mapping of each of a plurality of data type identifiers to one of a plurality of applications that are registered for each of a plurality of data types, wherein the plurality of data types identifiers are organized by a plurality of category types. Applicants also assert that the invention of Claims 1 and 13 do not include the essential limitation of translating the identification data from the SNMP sub-agent and the SNMP command from a first format to a second format as taught by

Champlin (Col. 3, lines 46-56; Col. 4, lines 23-32). Accordingly, Claims 1 and 13 are patentable over Champlin.

Claims 2-7 and 14-20 are dependent upon Claims 1 and 13, respectively, and incorporate all the limitation therein. Therefore, Claims 2-7 and 14-20 patentable over Champlin for the same reasons advanced in support of Claims 1 and 13. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 13-20 is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by the combination of Champlin and Fox et al. (US Patent No. 6,654,786). With regard to Claim 8, the rejection alleges that Champlin teaches: a) a sending application resident on a first computer system selecting a wireless transport mechanism and passing data to a first utility program resident on said first computer system; b) said first utility program, adding a token, a data type category identifier, and a data type identifier to said data to form an information packet and then, transparently to said sending application, using said wireless transport mechanism to transmit said information packet to a second computer system; c) a second utility program, resident on said second portable computer system, locating said data type identifier in said information packet using said token; d) said second utility program indexing a relevant category of said application registry with said data type identifier to determine a destination application that is associated with said data type identifier, wherein said application registry comprises identifiers of a plurality of different data type categories comprising: an Extension category; a MIME type category and an Application Creator category, and wherein said data type category identifier of

said information packet identifies said relevant category; and e) supplying said data packet to said destination application.

Applicants respectfully assert that neither Champlin nor Fox teach or suggest a first utility program adding a token, a first category type identifier corresponding to the data type of the data, and a first data type identifier corresponding to the data type of the data, to the data to form an information packet. Neither Champlin nor Fox teach or suggest the second utility program locating the first data type identifier and the first category type identifier in the information packet using the token. Neither Champlin nor Fox teach or suggest the second utility program indexing a relevant one of a plurality of category types of an application registry. The relevant category of the application registry being indexed utilizing the first data type identifier to determine a destination application. Wherein the relevant one of the plurality of categories corresponds to the first category type identifier. Applicants also assert that the invention of Claim 8 does not include the essential limitation of translating the identification data from the SNMP sub-agent and the SNMP command from a first format to a second format as taught by Champlin (Col. 3, lines 46-56; Col. 4, lines 23-32). Accordingly, Claim 8 is patentable over Champlin, Fox and the combination thereof.

Claims 9-12 are dependent upon Claim 8, and incorporate all the limitation therein. Therefore, Claims 9-12 are patentable over Champlin, Fox and the combination thereof for the same reasons advanced in support of Claims 8. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 9-12 is thus respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/811,994
Amdt. Dated October 18, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2004

Conclusion


For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: *October 18, 2004*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric J. Gash", written over a horizontal line.

Eric J. Gash
Registration No. 46,274
Tel.: (408) 938-9060